

## REMARKS

We are in receipt of the Office Action dated March 13, 2033, and the above Amendment and following remarks are made in light thereof.

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Pursuant to the Office Action, claims 1-4, 13-16 and 20 are rejected for being anticipated by Miyazaki et al., 5,757,451. Claims 6, 7, 18, and 19 are rejected for being obvious over Miyazaki et al. Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 13-16, and 18-20 are rejected for being anticipated by Okubo et al., 4,470,667. Claims 1-3, 5, 8-10, 13-15, 17 and 20 are rejected as being anticipated by Nagayama et al., 5,680,187. Claim 6, 7, 11, 12, 18 and 19 stand rejected for being obvious over Nagayama et al.

The title of the invention was objected to for not being descriptive. Additionally, claims 5, 17 and 20 are rejected to due to certain informalities. By the foregoing Amendment, the title has been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Additionally, claims 5 and 17 have been canceled and claim 20 amended as suggested by the Examiner.

Turning to the substantive aspects of the Office Action, Miyazaki et al. discloses, in Fig. 2, an electro-optical device comprising light shield in portions with a lamination of a first (blue) colored layer 58B and a second (red) colored layer 58R formed overlapping a channel region 54 of switching elements. In addition, there are a plurality of pixel electrodes 61, with light-shielding portions covering regions between the adjacent pixel electrodes. However, Miyazaki et al. fails to disclose the feature that the light shielding portion be provided over an opposing substrate included in both claims 1

and 14. Accordingly, applicant believes that claims 1-4, 6, 7, 13-16 and 18-20 fully distinguish over Miyazaki et al.

Okubo et al. discloses in Figs. 3, 4, 11 and 12, shielding portions comprising lamination of red and blue colored layers, overlapping a channel region of a TFT on the same substrate (Fig. 12). Additionally, the lamination covers regions between adjacent pixel electrodes. However, Okubo et al. fails to disclose the feature that the light shielding portion is provided over an opposing substrate. Claims 1 and 13 have been amended to recite this limitation. Thus, it is believed that each of claims 1-4, 6, 7, 13-16 and 18-20 fully distinguish over Okubo et al.

Nagayama et al. discloses in Fig. 1 an LCD with light-shielding portions comprising a lamination of red 46R and blue 46B colored layers, overlapping a channel region of a TFT on the opposing substrate. However, Nagayama et al. fails to disclose the feature that a liquid crystal is between one of said light shielding portions and said channel forming region. This limitation has been incorporated into each of claims 1, 8 and 13. Accordingly, it is believed that each of claims 1-3, 5-7, 11-15, and 17-20 fully distinguish over Nagayama et al.

Accordingly, Applicant believes that each of the rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action has been addressed and that the claims are now in condition for allowance. An early Office Action in this regard is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 14, 2003

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Stephen B. Heller  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No.: 30,181

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,  
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.  
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 236-8500